

## REMARKS

Claims 1-17 has been amended. Claim 19 has been canceled. A new claim 19 has been added.

The Examiner objected to the information disclosure, because the referenced list is improper. The reference list has now been transferred to an Information Disclosure Statement form. It is believed that the Information Disclosure Statement is now proper.

The Examiner objected to claims 5 and claim 14. Claim 5 is missing in the original application. The claims have now been renumbered to avoid the missing number. The Examiner objected to the acronym “CLESS” in claim 14. The acronym has been spelled out as “constrained Least Square Solver” as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejected claims 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite, citing that “the group” lacks an antecedence basis. These claims are Markush claims. The use of “the group” is a standard practice. Please withdraw this rejection. If the Examiner feels that the word “the” should be replaced with “a”, please do so.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 and 19 under 35 USC 101, citing that “the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter” in reciting a method according to mathematic algorithm. The claims have been amended to claim specified apparatus, adaptive linear system. It is believed that the claims are no longer directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14, 6, 9-10, 11-12, 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Martin et al. Martin uses one BOT and one real subspace estimator to implement a complex subspace estimator. Our invention uses one BOT, two real LESS and one IBOT to implement a complex LESS. Thus, by limiting claim 1 to comprise two real LESS, it is

believed that claims is no longer anticipated. Since 2-4, 6, 11-12, 14 and 19 are dependent claim of claim 1, it follows that these dependent claims are also no longer anticipated by Martin.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-8 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Martin et al. These claims are dependent on claim 1. Since claim 1 has been amended to be different from Martin as explained in the foregoing paragraph, it follows that claim 1 and its dependent claims 7-8 and 15-18 are no longer obvious over Martin.

In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 1-19, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Reexamination of the objections and rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1-19 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.**

By: Ronald Spuhler

34th Floor  
500 West Madison Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60661  
(312) 757-8133